

# EXHIBIT A

**United States District Court  
District of Massachusetts (Boston)  
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:01-cv-10143-PBS**

Baron v. Hickey, et al  
Assigned to: Judge Patti B. Saris  
Referred to:  
Demand: \$0  
Lead Docket: None  
Related Cases: None  
Case in other court: None  
Cause: 28:1441 Notice of Removal

Date Filed: 01/25/01  
Jury Demand: Defendant  
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other  
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

**Plaintiff****Bruce Baron**

represented by **Carolyn Conway**  
DiMento & Sullivan  
7 Faneuil Marketplace  
Boston, MA 02109-1649  
523-2345  
**LEAD ATTORNEY**  
**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

V.

**Defendant****Daniel Hickey, Suffolk County Sheriff's Department**

represented by **Douglas I. Louison**  
Merrick, Louison & Costello  
67 Batterymarch Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
617-439-0305  
**LEAD ATTORNEY**  
**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

**Kathleen M. Cawley**  
Suffolk County Sheriff's Department  
200 Nashua Street  
Boston, MA 02114  
617-989-6680  
Fax : 617-989-6693  
Email: [Kathy\\_Cawley@scsdma.org](mailto:Kathy_Cawley@scsdma.org)  
**LEAD ATTORNEY**  
**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

**Stephen C. Pfaff**  
Merrick, Louison & Costello  
Suite 3  
67 Batterymarch Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
617-439-0305  
Fax : 617-439-0325  
Email: [spfaff@merricklc.com](mailto:spfaff@merricklc.com)  
**LEAD ATTORNEY**  
**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

**Sheriff of Suffolk County**

represented by **Kathleen M. Cawley**  
(See above for address)

***LEAD ATTORNEY***  
***ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED***

**Suffolk County Sheriff's Department**

represented by **Kathleen M. Cawley**  
(See above for address)  
***LEAD ATTORNEY***  
***ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED***

**Cross Claimant**

**Daniel Hickey**

represented by **Douglas I. Louison**  
(See above for address)  
***LEAD ATTORNEY***  
***ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED***

**Stephen C. Pfaff**  
(See above for address)  
***LEAD ATTORNEY***  
***ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED***

V.

**Cross Defendant**

**Sheriff of Suffolk County**

**Cross Claimant**

**Daniel Hickey**

represented by **Douglas I. Louison**  
(See above for address)  
***LEAD ATTORNEY***  
***ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED***

**Kathleen M. Cawley**  
(See above for address)  
***LEAD ATTORNEY***  
***ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED***

**Stephen C. Pfaff**  
(See above for address)  
***LEAD ATTORNEY***  
***ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED***

V.

**Cross Defendant**

**Bruce Baron**

represented by **Carolyn Conway**  
(See above for address)  
***LEAD ATTORNEY***  
***ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED***

Filing Date	#	Docket Text

01/25/2001	1	Notice of Removal filed. Received from: Suffolk Superior Court; State Court Docket #: 01-0067. Assigned to: Honorable Patti B. Saris Receipt #: 28315 Amount: \$ 150.00. Fee status: pd (pc) (Entered: 01/25/2001)
01/30/2001	2	State Court Record, copy of Notice of Removal sent to State Court, filed. (pc) (Entered: 01/30/2001)
01/31/2001	3	Consent of removal (pc) (Entered: 02/02/2001)
02/14/2001	4	Motion by Daniel Hickey to extend time to March 9, 2001 to respond to complaint , filed, c/s. (pc) (Entered: 02/14/2001)
02/14/2001		Judge Patti B. Saris. Endorsed Order entered granting [4-1] motion to extend time to March 9, 2001 to respond to complaint. [EOD Date 2/14/01], cc/cl. (pc) (Entered: 02/14/2001)
03/08/2001	5	Motion by Daniel Hickey to dismiss pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12 (b)(6) , filed, c/s. (pc) (Entered: 03/08/2001)
03/08/2001	6	Memorandum by Daniel Hickey in support of [5-1] motion to dismiss pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12 (b)(6), filed, c/s. (pc) (Entered: 03/08/2001)
03/12/2001	7	Answer to complaint; jury demand by Daniel Hickey and cross-claim against Sheriff of Suffolk, filed, c/s. (pc) (Entered: 03/12/2001)
03/13/2001	8	Judge Patti B. Saris. Notice of Scheduling conference: set scheduling conference for 3:15 on 4/26/01 , cc/cl. (pc) (Entered: 03/13/2001)
03/13/2001	9	Judge Patti B. Saris. Procedural Order entered re: Initial Scheduling Conference. [EOD Date 3/13/01], cc/cl. (pc) (Entered: 03/13/2001)
03/16/2001	10	Motion by Bruce Baron to extend time to April 13, 2001 to file response to Defendants' Suffolk County Sheriff's Department and Sheriff of Suffolk County's Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Federal R. Civ. P. 12.(b)(6) , filed, c/s. (pc) (Entered: 03/16/2001)
03/22/2001		Judge Patti B. Saris. Endorsed Order entered granting [10-1] motion to extend time to April 13, 2001 to file response to Defendants' Suffolk County Sheriff's Department and Sheriff of Suffolk County's Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Federal R. Civ. P. 12.(b)(6). [EOD Date 3/22/01], cc/cl. (pc) (Entered: 03/22/2001)
04/12/2001	11	Response by Bruce Baron in opposition to [5-1] motion to dismiss pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12 (b)(6), filed, c/s. (pc) (Entered: 04/16/2001)
04/12/2001	12	Memorandum by Bruce Baron in support of [11-1] opposition response to motion to dismiss pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6), filed, c/s. (pc) (Entered: 04/16/2001)
06/12/2001	13	Judge Patti B. Saris . Notice of Hearing/conference: set scheduling conference for 2:15 7/19/01 . cc/cl (fmr) (Entered: 06/12/2001)
06/12/2001	14	Judge Patti B. Saris . Procedural Order entered re: Initial Scheduling Conference . [EOD Date 6/12/01] cc/cl (fmr) (Entered: 06/12/2001)
06/13/2001		Judge Patti B. Saris. Endorsed Order entered granting [5-1] motion to dismiss pursuant to

		Fed.R.Civ.P. 12 (b)(6). "Allowed with respect to count Six (Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress) against the sheriff and the county, otherwise denied." [EOD Date 6/18/01], cc/cl. (pc) (Entered: 06/18/2001)
07/11/2001	15	Notice of appearance of attorney for Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk by Kathleen M. Cawley, filed. (pc) (Entered: 07/12/2001)
07/18/2001	16	Joint statement by Bruce Baron, Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk, re: Local Rule 16, filed. (pc) (Entered: 07/18/2001)
07/19/2001		Scheduling conference held. (pc) (Entered: 07/19/2001)
07/19/2001	17	Judge Patti B. Saris. Clerk's Notes: re: Scheduling Conference held, court adopts 16.1 joint statement as the case scheduling order, fact discovery deadline: 12/31/01, summary judgment motions filing deadline: 1/31/02, oppositions to summary judgment motions filing deadline: 2/23/02, case to be referred to ADR program: Fall, 2001 , set motion filing deadline for 2/23/02 , set discovery due for 12/31/01 Court Reporter: (pc) (Entered: 07/19/2001)
07/19/2001	18	Judge Patti B. Saris . Scheduling Order entered setting 12/31/01 for discovery deadline. [EOD Date 7/19/01], cc/cl. (pc) (Entered: 07/19/2001)
07/19/2001	19	Judge Patti B. Saris. Order of reference entered for Alternative Dispute Resolution. Referred to: Senior Judges for: Mediation, civil rights (pc) (Entered: 07/19/2001)
10/10/2001	20	Notice of assignment of ADR Provider issued. Assigned to: Judge Skinner for: Mediation (pc) (Entered: 10/10/2001)
10/22/2001	21	Answer by Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk to complaint; jury demand, filed. (pc) (Entered: 10/22/2001)
10/23/2001	22	Report by Walter J Skinner of Alternative Dispute Resolution proceedings. The case was: not settled. Further efforts to settle this case at this time are, in my judgment unlikely to be productive. (pc) (Entered: 10/24/2001)
10/24/2001		Case no longer referred to ADR. (pc) (Entered: 10/24/2001)
01/30/2002	23	Joint motion by Bruce Baron, Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk to extend Scheduling order to establish the folowing dates; discovery-5/31/02, S/J motions-6/28/02, oppositions to S/J motions by 7/19/02 , filed. (ms) (Entered: 01/30/2002)
01/31/2002		Judge Patti B. Saris. Endorsed Order entered granting [23-1] joint motion to extend Scheduling order to establish the folowing dates; discovery-5/31/02, S/J motions-6/28/02, oppositions to S/J motions by 7/19/02, set discovery due for 5/31/02 , set S/J motion filing deadline for 6/28/02 , Response to S/J motion ddl-7/19/02 .cc/cl [EOD Date 2/1/02] (ms) (Entered: 02/01/2002)
06/17/2002	24	Second Joint motion by Bruce Baron, Daniel Hickey to extend scheduling order , filed. . (ms) (Entered: 06/19/2002)
07/01/2002		Judge Patti B. Saris. Endorsed Order entered denying [24-1] joint motion to extend scheduling order, The parties may have an extra 2 weeks to file motions for S/J and oppositions. reset motion filing deadline for 7/12/02 , Response to S/J motion due 8/2/02

		cc/cl. [EOD Date 7/2/02] (ms) (Entered: 07/02/2002)
07/12/2002	29	Motion by Sheriff of Suffolk, Suffolk County Sher for summary judgment , filed. (ms) (Entered: 07/15/2002)
07/12/2002	30	Statement of undisputed Facts by Sheriff of Suffolk, Suffolk County Sher re: [29-1] motion for summary judgment filed. (ms) (Entered: 07/15/2002)
07/12/2002	31	Memorandum by Sheriff of Suffolk, Suffolk County Sher in support of [30-1] statement, [29-1] motion for summary judgment, filed. (ms) (Entered: 07/15/2002)
08/01/2002	32	Response by Bruce Baron in opposition to [29-1] motion for summary judgment , filed. (ms) (Entered: 08/02/2002)
08/01/2002	33	Memorandum by Bruce Baron in support of [32-1] opposition response to motion for Summary Judgement, filed. (ms) (Entered: 08/02/2002)
08/06/2002	34	Judge Patti B. Saris. Notice of motion Hearing: Motion hearing set for 3:15 10/17/02 for [29-1] motion for summary judgment . cc/cl (ms) (Entered: 08/06/2002)
08/07/2002	35	Motion by Sheriff of Suffolk for leave to file reply to pltfs opposition to defts motion for S/J , filed. (ms) (Entered: 08/07/2002)
08/09/2002	36	Judge Patti B. Saris. Notice of Hearing/conference: Motion hearing set for 2:00 10/31/02 for [29-1] motion for summary judgment . cc/cl (ms) (Entered: 08/12/2002)
08/12/2002	37	Response by Bruce Baron in opposition to [35-1] motion for leave to file reply to pltfs opposition to defts motion for S/J, filed. c/s (ms) (Entered: 08/13/2002)
10/31/2002		Motion hearing re: [29-1] motion for summary judgment Motion hearing held (ms) (Entered: 11/18/2002)
10/31/2002	40	Judge Patti B. Saris. Clerk's Notes: re: Motion hearing Court hears argument of counsel. Parties to supplement within 2 weeks. Parties to then file replies within one week therefrom. [29-1] motion for summary judgment taken under advisement Court Reporter: Marie Cloonan (ms) (Entered: 11/18/2002)
11/13/2002	38	Motion by Bruce Baron To supplement opposition to deft's motion for S/J , filed. (ms) (Entered: 11/14/2002)
11/14/2002	39	Response by Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk in opposition to [32-1] opposition response, filed. (ms) (Entered: 11/18/2002)
11/21/2002	41	Reply by Bruce Baron to Pltfs [39-1] opposition response to pltfs opposition to defts motion for S/J, filed. (ms) (Entered: 11/22/2002)
11/21/2002	42	Response by Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk in opposition to [38-1] motion To supplement opposition to deft's motion for S/J, filed. (ms) (Entered: 11/22/2002)
12/03/2002	43	Motion by Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk to strike [41-1] references in reply , filed. (ms) (Entered: 12/04/2002)

01/22/2003		Terminated document:[35-1] motion for leave to file reply to pltfs opposition to defts motion for S/J Requested by rca. (rca) (Entered: 01/22/2003)
01/31/2003	<u>44</u>	Judge Patti B. Saris . Memorandum and Order entered. After hearing, the [29-1] motion for summary judgment is allowed in part and denied in part. The motion for S/J by the county is ALLOWED with respect to the Mass civil Rights act claim, but DENIED with respect to the remaining claims. The Sheriffs motion for Summary Judgement on the ground of qualified immunity is ALLOWED. cc/cl [EOD Date 2/4/03] (ms) (Entered: 02/04/2003)
02/06/2003	<u>45</u>	Judge Patti B. Saris. Notice of Final pretrial conference and Jury trial: set pretrial conference for 2:00 4/28/03 , set Jury trial for 9:00 5/5/03 cc/cl. (ms) (Entered: 02/06/2003)
02/06/2003	<u>46</u>	Judge Patti B. Saris. Pretrial Order entered. Jury Trial -5/5/03 at 9:00; Final pretrial cnf- 4/28/03 at 2:00; expert disclosures by 2/27/03; Pretrial disclosures by 3/28/03; Objections to pretrial disclosures by 4/11/03; Joint pretrial memorandum by 4/21/03; file/serve proposed jury instr., motions in lim, witness/exhibit list by 4/14/03; file/serve oppositions to motions by 4/21/03; trial briefs by 4/28/03. cc/c [EOD Date 2/6/03] (ms) (Entered: 02/06/2003)
03/12/2003	<u>47</u>	Motion by Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk to bifurcate , filed. (ms) (Entered: 03/12/2003)
03/12/2003	<u>48</u>	Memorandum by Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk in support of [47-1] motion to bifurcate , filed. (ms) (Entered: 03/12/2003)
03/21/2003	<u>49</u>	Response by Bruce Baron in opposition to [47-1] motion to bifurcate, filed. (ms) (Entered: 03/24/2003)
03/24/2003		Judge Patti B. Saris. Endorsed Order entered denying [47-1] motion to bifurcate. cc/cl [EOD Date 3/26/03] (ms) (Entered: 03/26/2003)
03/26/2003	<u>50</u>	Judge Patti B. Saris. Notice of Rescheduled final pretrial conference: reset pretrial conference for 3:30 4/29/03 cc/cl. (ms) (Entered: 03/26/2003)
03/26/2003	<u>51</u>	Joint motion by Bruce Baron, Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk to continue trial date , filed. (ms) (Entered: 03/27/2003)
03/26/2003	<u>52</u>	Affidavit of Kathleen M. Cawley, re: [51-1] joint motion to continue trial date, filed. (ms) (Entered: 03/27/2003)
03/28/2003	<u>53</u>	Pretrial disclosure pursuant to Rule 26(a)(3) by Sheriff of Suffolk filed. (ms) (Entered: 03/31/2003)
03/31/2003		Judge Patti B. Saris. Endorsed Order entered denying [51-1] joint motion to continue trial date. Denied, However, if you are on trial before Judge O'Toole, I will move it to the next week. cc/cl [EOD Date 4/1/03] (ms) (Entered: 04/01/2003)
03/31/2003	<u>54</u>	Pretrial disclosure pursuant to Rule 26(a)(3) by Bruce Baron filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/02/2003)
04/09/2003	<u>55</u>	Objection by Bruce Baron re: Evidence in Defts Pretrial Disclosure, filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/09/2003)
04/10/2003	<u>56</u>	Objection by Sheriff of Suffolk re: [54-1] Pltfs pretrial disclosure, filed. (ms) (Entered:

		04/10/2003)
04/14/2003	<u>57</u>	Proposed Jury instructions by Bruce Baron , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/14/2003)
04/14/2003	<u>58</u>	Proposed voir dire questions by Bruce Baron , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/14/2003)
04/14/2003	<u>59</u>	Motion by Bruce Baron in limine , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/14/2003)
04/14/2003	<u>60</u>	Witness/exhibit list by Bruce Baron , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/14/2003)
04/14/2003	<u>63</u>	Proposed voir dire questions by Suffolk County Sher , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/15/2003)
04/14/2003	<u>64</u>	Motion by Suffolk County Sher in limine to exclude the introduction of the stern commission report , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/15/2003)
04/14/2003	<u>65</u>	Motion by Suffolk County Sher in limine to allow questioning of the pltf regarding allegation of sexual misconduct , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/15/2003)
04/14/2003	<u>66</u>	Motion by Suffolk County Sher in limine to admit evidence of allegations of misconduct by the pltf , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/15/2003)
04/14/2003	<u>67</u>	Witness/exhibit list by Suffolk County Sher, filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/15/2003)
04/14/2003	<u>68</u>	Pretrial disclosure pursuant to Rule 26(a)(3) by Suffolk County Sher filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/15/2003)
04/14/2003	<u>69</u>	Memorandum by Suffolk County Sher in support of [59-1] motion in limine, filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/15/2003)
04/15/2003	<u>61</u>	Judge Patti B. Saris. Notice of rescheduled jury trial: reset Jury trial for 9:00 5/12/03 . The final pretrial conference remains as scheduled for 4/29/03 at 3:30. cc/cl (ms) (Entered: 04/15/2003)
04/15/2003	<u>62</u>	Proposed Jury instructions by Suffolk County Sher , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/15/2003)
04/18/2003	<u>70</u>	Assented To Motion by Daniel Hickey to continue trial , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/18/2003)
04/18/2003	<u>71</u>	Motion by Daniel Hickey To conduct Pltfs deposition , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/18/2003)
04/21/2003	<u>72</u>	Response by Suffolk County Sher in opposition to [57-1] instructions jury , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/22/2003)
04/21/2003	<u>73</u>	Joint memorandum by Bruce Baron, Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk re: pretrial, filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/22/2003)
04/21/2003	<u>74</u>	Motion by Bruce Baron to amend complaint , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/22/2003)
04/21/2003	<u>75</u>	Response by Bruce Baron in opposition to [66-1] motion in limine to admit evidence of allegations of misconduct by pltf, filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/22/2003)

04/21/2003	76	Response by Bruce Baron in opposition to [71-1] motion To conduct Pltfs deposition , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/22/2003)
04/24/2003		Judge Patti B. Saris. Endorsed Order entered denying [70-1] motion to continue trial. Denied as untimely, also, there are two attys for Mr. Hickey. cc/cl [EOD Date 4/24/03] (ms) (Entered: 04/24/2003)
04/25/2003	77	Proposed Jury instructions by Daniel Hickey, filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/25/2003)
04/25/2003	78	Witness/exhibit list by Daniel Hickey, filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/25/2003)
04/25/2003	79	Pretrial disclosure pursuant to Rule 26(a)(3) by Daniel Hickey filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/25/2003)
04/25/2003	80	Motion by Daniel Hickey in limine to admit evidence of allegations of misconduct , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/25/2003)
04/25/2003	81	Motion by Daniel Hickey in limine to allow questioning of the pltfs regarding allegations of sexual misconduct , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/25/2003)
04/25/2003	82	Motion by Daniel Hickey in limine to exclude the introduction of the Stearn Commission Report , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/25/2003)
04/25/2003	83	Proposed voir dire questions by Daniel Hickey , filed. (ms) (Entered: 04/25/2003)
04/29/2003		Pre-trial conference held. (ms) (Entered: 04/30/2003)
04/29/2003	84	Judge Patti B. Saris. Clerk's Notes: re: Final pretrial cnf; Pltfs counsel informs the court that the case will go forward to trial. Court discusses with counsel various evidentiary issues. Court Reporter: Lee Marzilli (ms) (Entered: 04/30/2003)
05/01/2003		Terminated document: [38-1] motion To supplement opposition to deft's motion for S/J. Requested by rca. (rca) (Entered: 05/01/2003)
05/01/2003		Terminated document: [43-1] motion to strike [41-1] references in reply Requested by rca. (rca) (Entered: 05/01/2003)
05/06/2003	85	Trial Brief by Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk, filed. (ms) (Entered: 05/07/2003)
05/08/2003	86	Trial Brief by Bruce Baron, filed. (ms) (Entered: 05/09/2003)
05/08/2003	87	Answer by Daniel Hickey to amended complaint, filed.; jury demand (ms) (Entered: 05/09/2003)
05/08/2003	87	Crossclaim by Daniel Hickey against Bruce Baron, filed. (ms) (Entered: 05/09/2003)
05/08/2003	88	Trial brief by Daniel Hickey, filed. (ms) (Entered: 05/09/2003)
05/08/2003		Judge Patti B. Saris. Endorsed Order entered denying [71-1] motion To conduct Pltfs deposition. cc/cl [EOD Date 5/9/03] (ms) (Entered: 05/09/2003)

05/12/2003		Jury trial held. day 1 (ms) (Entered: 05/13/2003)
05/12/2003	89	Judge Patti B. Saris. Clerk's Notes: re: Jury Trial; Voir dire held; Jury empaneled. Jury sworn; Judge gives preliminary instructions to jury; Counsel make opening arguments. pltf present its case. Court recesses at 1:00 for lunch; resumes; court recesses at 3:45 Court Reporter: Lee Marzilli (ms) (Entered: 05/13/2003)
05/13/2003		Jury trial held day 2. (ms) (Entered: 05/13/2003)
05/13/2003	90	Judge Patti B. Saris. Clerk's Notes: re: jury trial Court Reporter: Lee Marzilli (ms) (Entered: 05/13/2003)
05/14/2003		Jury trial held . (ms) (Entered: 05/15/2003)
05/14/2003	91	Judge Patti B. Saris. Clerk's Notes: re: Jury Trial;Day 3. Court recesses at 12:55pm; After jury is dismissed for the day, Court hears argument of various dispositive motions. Court makes rulings on the record in open court. Court Reporter: Janet Konarski (ms) (Entered: 05/15/2003)
05/14/2003	97	MOTION for Judgment as a Matter of Law at the close of Pltf's case by Daniel Hickey. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/20/2003)
05/14/2003	98	MOTION for Directed Verdict by Sheriff of Suffolk County.(Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/20/2003)
05/15/2003	92	Electronic Clerk's Notes for proceedings held before Judge Patti B. Saris : Jury Trial completed on 5/15/2003. see imaged clerk note (Court Reporter Janet Konarski.) (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/20/2003)
05/15/2003	93	SPECIAL JURY VERDICT in favor of Plaintiff, Baron against Deft, Hickey, suffolk County. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/20/2003)
05/15/2003	94	Jury trial Witness List. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/20/2003)
05/15/2003	95	Jury trial Exhibit List. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/20/2003)
05/15/2003	96	STIPULATION re: documents submitted to Investigator by Bruce Baron, Daniel Hickey, Sheriff of Suffolk County. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/20/2003)
05/15/2003		Judge Patti B. Saris : Electronic ORDER entered re: 97 Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law; The claims of assault and battery and defamation are time-barred. Otherwise denied (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/20/2003)
05/15/2003		Judge Patti B. Saris : Electronic ORDER entered re: 99 Motion for Directed Verdict. Denied, with respect to the common law claim. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/20/2003)
05/16/2003	100	Judge Patti B. Saris : ORDER entered JUDGMENT in favor of Deft, Hickey against Pltf, Baron(Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/20/2003)
05/20/2003	99	MOTION for Directed Verdict by Suffolk County Sheriff's Department.(Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/20/2003)

05/27/2003	<u>101</u>	MOTION for New Trial by Suffolk County Sheriff's Department.(Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/29/2003)
05/27/2003	<u>102</u>	MOTION for Remittitur of damages or in the alternative a new trial by Suffolk County Sheriff's Department.(Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/29/2003)
05/27/2003	<u>103</u>	MOTION for Judgment as a Matter of Law by Suffolk County Sheriff's Department. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/29/2003)
05/27/2003	<u>104</u>	MOTION for Leave to File memorandum in excess of 20 pages by Suffolk County Sheriff's Department.(Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/29/2003)
05/27/2003	<u>105</u>	MEMORANDUM in Support re <u>103</u> MOTION for Judgment as a Matter of Law, <u>101</u> MOTION for New Trial, <u>102</u> MOTION Remittitur of damages or in the alternative a new trial filed by Suffolk County Sheriff's Department. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/29/2003)
05/27/2003	<u>106</u>	CERTIFICATE OF CONSULTATION re <u>103</u> MOTION for Judgment as a Matter of Law, <u>104</u> MOTION for Leave to File, <u>105</u> Memorandum in Support of Motion, <u>101</u> MOTION for New Trial, <u>102</u> MOTION Remittitur of damages or in the alternative a new trial by Kathleen M. Cawley on behalf of Suffolk County Sheriff's Department. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/29/2003)
05/27/2003	<u>107</u>	MOTION for Attorney Fees and costs by Bruce Baron.(Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/29/2003)
05/28/2003	<u>108</u>	Corrected AFFIDAVIT of Francis J. Dimento, Jr.. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/29/2003)
05/30/2003		Judge Patti B. Saris : Electronic ORDER entered granting <u>104</u> Motion for Leave to File memorandum in excess of 20 pages (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 05/30/2003)
06/02/2003	<u>109</u>	Judge Patti B. Saris : ORDER entered. Order of Costs entered for Attorney Francis J. DiMento, Jr. in the amount of \$859.55. (Alba, Robert) (Entered: 06/02/2003)
06/05/2003		Judge Patti B. Saris : ORDER entered granting re <u>104</u> MOTION for Leave to File memorandum filed by Suffolk County Sheriff's Department(Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 06/05/2003)
06/10/2003	<u>110</u>	MEMORANDUM in Opposition re <u>102</u> MOTION Remittitur of damages or in the alternative a new trial filed by Bruce Baron. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 06/12/2003)
06/10/2003	<u>111</u>	MEMORANDUM OF LAW in support of opposition by Bruce Baron to <u>110</u> Memorandum in Opposition to Motion. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 06/12/2003)
06/17/2003	<u>112</u>	MEMORANDUM in Opposition re <u>107</u> MOTION for Attorney Fees filed by Suffolk County Sheriff's Department. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 06/18/2003)
11/05/2003	<u>113</u>	Judge Patti B. Saris : ORDER entered MEMORANDUM AND ORDER. For the forgoing reasons, the defts motions <u>103</u> motion for judgement <u>102</u> motion for damages <u>101</u> motion for new trial are denied.(Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 11/06/2003)
11/06/2003		Civil Case Terminated. (Simeone, Maria) (Entered: 11/06/2003)

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
11/13/2003 16:49:37			
PACER Login:	th0015	Client Code:	9771/1
Description:	Docket Report	Case Number:	1:01-cv-10143-PBS
Billable Pages:	6	Cost:	0.42

## EXHIBIT B



229  
 1 Sullivan, Gerry Leone and someone else. I  
 2 have no idea who.  
 3 Q The U.S. Attorney was there?  
 4 A Yes.  
 5 Q His first assistant was there?  
 6 A Yes.  
 7 Q Sheriff Cabral was there?  
 8 A Yes.  
 9 Q Various other people were there?  
 10 A Yes.  
 11 Q And you don't recall anything about this  
 12 meeting?  
 13 MS. CAULO: Objection.  
 14 MS. HARVEY: Objection.  
 15 A I recall what the topic was about. I recall  
 16 Huggard opening up a criminal statute book.  
 17 I was a pretty small player at that meeting,  
 18 and the shock of being told we were criminals  
 19 was pretty huge concerning that that's not  
 20 what we were told why we were going there  
 21 for.  
 22 Q Were you told that the meeting was going to  
 23 be for a specific purpose?  
 24 A It was related to me that the meeting was to

231  
 1 me as this pervasively negative atmosphere  
 2 where there was a whole separate world going  
 3 on that we had no knowledge about and that  
 4 people would come in and clam up and say I'm  
 5 not saying anything about this.  
 6 When we did interviews with officers,  
 7 they would respond to our questions. We  
 8 developed a pretty decent relationship with  
 9 the union, worked out questioning, and we  
 10 were getting responses. It was more like  
 11 people would answer what you were asking, and  
 12 if you kind of had your ducks in a row and  
 13 you had done some homework, people would tell  
 14 you where they were, what they were doing and  
 15 what they saw to a pretty decent extent.  
 16 Would I say it was a hundred percent,  
 17 where they were giving us everything we asked  
 18 for? No. But it wasn't like in the movies.  
 19 It wasn't that big a code of silence. Was it  
 20 an open atmosphere where officers would run  
 21 down and tell SID or their captains  
 22 everything? No.  
 23 Q What do you understand the phrase, code of  
 24 silence to mean?

230  
 1 be about enhancing the relationship between  
 2 our two departments.  
 3 Q Who relayed that to you?  
 4 A I can't recall who. It probably would have  
 5 been the Chief of Staff.  
 6 Q Did you participate in any other meetings  
 7 with members of the U.S. Attorney's Office or  
 8 the FBI --  
 9 A No.  
 10 Q -- concerning Mrs. Porter's barring?  
 11 A No.  
 12 Q When you arrived at the House of Corrections  
 13 in February, 2003, was there a code of  
 14 silence at the House of Corrections?  
 15 MS. CAULO: Objection.  
 16 A Yes and no.  
 17 Q Can you explain?  
 18 A Yes, in the sense that if you're asking do  
 19 people come and volunteer and tell us what's  
 20 going on in the units? No. There is not a  
 21 lot of people running forward to tell us on a  
 22 daily basis what transpires, both officers  
 23 and inmates alike.  
 24 No, in the sense that it didn't strike

232  
 1 A It means that when people see something or  
 2 are aware of something, they won't say  
 3 anything at any cost. When asked, they  
 4 deny.  
 5 Q Do you understand that the Stern Commission  
 6 report addressed the code of silence that  
 7 they believed was present at that time?  
 8 A I do. I wouldn't deny that there was  
 9 something there, but again, I don't feel it  
 10 was a pervasively evil atmosphere. I think  
 11 much of the Stern Commission was accurate,  
 12 but much of it was inaccurate. The people  
 13 that came to evaluate didn't a significant  
 14 amount of time. They didn't work the blocks.  
 15 So it wasn't as bad in some ways, but I'm not  
 16 going to lie and say that there was nothing  
 17 there.  
 18 Q Do you believe that a piece of the Stern  
 19 Commission report was not accurate?  
 20 MS. HARVEY: Objection.  
 21 MS. CAULO: Objection.  
 22 A I just answered that there was some accuracy  
 23 to it. To say that there was a pervasive  
 24 code of silence, my opinion when I came on

237  
 1 training, received a makeup academy training  
 2 that would give them that basis, and we spend  
 3 a tremendous amount of effort educating  
 4 officers that it's critical to document, tell  
 5 the truth, be a professional.

6 So in conjunction with aggressive  
 7 investigation and aggressive discipline for  
 8 failure to, I believe there is a change  
 9 occurring.

10 Q Is it your understanding that retaliation  
 11 against employees who report other employees  
 12 misconduct that that was part of the code of  
 13 silence?

14 A That would be an essential element to a code  
 15 of silence.

16 MR. SCHUMACHER: Could I have five  
 17 minutes? I might be done.

18 (Whereupon, a brief recess was held.)

19 MR. SCHUMACHER: Just a couple of  
 20 clean-up questions, and then I'll send you on  
 21 your way.

22 BY MR. SCHUMACHER:

23 Q The interview that took place between the SID  
 24 investigators and Mrs. Porter, the first one

239  
 1 Q What is your understanding what took place  
 2 with respect to that topic?  
 3 A Just if she contacted the FBI. I believe she  
 4 knew Krista Snyder, talked to Krista Snyder.  
 5 Q Why would SID want to know whether or not  
 6 Mrs. Porter had contacted Miss Snyder?  
 7 A My opinion it was curiosity on the part of  
 8 Investigator Dacey and Aleman. They knew  
 9 that the FBI had been contacted, and it  
 10 wasn't self-evident from whom.

11 She had mentioned in a previous  
 12 interview, she meaning Porter, that Rene had  
 13 had some contact with the Federal Government.  
 14 She brought up the wire on her own on the  
 15 22nd, so I think it was curiosity.

16 It wasn't a major part of their  
 17 investigation. They weren't ordered to do  
 18 it. I just think it's curiosity to close out  
 19 a loop, as you're doing today, and clearly,  
 20 it was an interesting issue, particularly  
 21 since what the FBI was coming back to us with  
 22 didn't match up with what was in the file.

23 Q Do you recall the SID investigators then  
 24 report to you with regard to their

238  
 1 on May 22nd, do you know who was present at  
 2 that interview?

3 A I don't have firsthand knowledge.

4 Q You don't know if anyone was there besides  
 5 the investigators and Mrs. Porter?

6 A I don't.

7 Q How about the second interview, the May 25th  
 8 interview?

9 A I don't.

10 MS. HARVEY: You mean May 29th.

11 MR. SCHUMACHER: I think it was May 26th  
 12 actually, because there were three  
 13 interviews.

14 Q You don't remember who was present at those  
 15 interviews either?

16 A I don't.

17 Q Are you aware at the second interview between  
 18 the SID and Mrs. Porter she was confronted  
 19 with whether or not she had contacted the FBI  
 20 concerning the Rosario allegations?

21 MS. CAULO: Objection.

22 A I'm not sure if she was confronted.

23 Q Was that topic discussed?

24 A Yes, it was in the report.

240  
 1 conversation with Mrs. Porter?  
 2 A If you're asking did they come running to me  
 3 and saying we got her, we got her? No. I  
 4 don't recall them coming to me on it. I know  
 5 it's in the report. So exactly when I would  
 6 have known, I don't recall. It would have  
 7 been shortly thereafter.

8 Q So you recall that shortly after that  
 9 interview you learned of what Mrs. Porter  
 10 told the SID investigators that day?

11 A Correct.

12 Q With respect to her communications with the  
 13 FBI?

14 A Yes. The case was almost due to be resolved.  
 15 When they wrapped it up, I reviewed it on  
 16 June 2nd. So only a few days later, they  
 17 were closing it up. In between the 29th and  
 18 June 2nd, I would have read that report and  
 19 talked to them.

20 Q Did you, in turn, tell either Miss Keeley or  
 21 Sheriff Cabral anything concerning

22 Mrs. Porter's communications with the FBI?

23 A Again, I don't recall doing so, but I may  
 24 have.

# EXHIBIT C

VOL: I  
PAGES: 1-202  
EXHIBITS: 1-6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

\*\*\*\*\*  
SHEILA J. PORTER, Plaintiff  
-vs- ANDREA CABRAL, SUFFOLK COUNTY Civil Action No. 04-11935-DPW  
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, SUFFOLK COUNTY and CORRECTIONAL MEDICAL SERVICES, INC., Defendants  
\*\*\*\*\*

CONFIDENTIAL PURSUANT TO THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

DEPOSITION OF ELIZABETH KEELEY, ESQUIRE, a witness called on behalf of the Plaintiff, in the above-captioned matter, said deposition being taken pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, before Patricia M. McLaughlin, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at the offices of Goodwin Procter LLP, Exchange Place, Boston, Massachusetts, on Wednesday, May 11, 2005, commencing at 10:08 a.m.

McLAUGHLIN & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTERS  
92 DEVIR STREET, SUITE 304  
MALDEN, MASSACHUSETTS 02148  
781.321.8922  
WWW.E-STENOGRAPHER.COM

2  
APPEARANCES:

DAVID S. SCHUMACHER, ESQUIRE

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

Exchange Place

Boston, Massachusetts 02109

On behalf of the Plaintiff

ELLEN CAULO, ESQUIRE

GENERAL COUNSEL

Suffolk County Sheriff's Department

200 Nashua Street

Boston, Massachusetts 02114

On behalf of the Defendants,

Andrea Cabral, Suffolk County

Sheriff's Department and Suffolk

County

ALEXANDRA B. HARVEY, ESQUIRE

ADLER, COHEN, HARVEY, WAKEMAN & GUELGUEZIAN

230 Congress Street

Boston, Massachusetts 02110

On behalf of the Defendant,

Correctional Medical Services, Inc.

3  
1 INDEX  
2 WITNESS DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS  
3 ELIZABETH KEELEY, ESQUIRE  
4 By Mr. Schumacher 5  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

4  
1 No. Exhibit Page  
2 1 Policy S220 78  
3 2 Case Summary, dated June 4, 2003 112  
4 3 Memorandum dated May 29, 2003 115  
5 4 List of S220 Violations 143  
6 5 Policy S220, revised April, 2005 154  
7 6 Press Statement 177  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

17

19

and I also was told that someone from SID was speaking with the FBI to get their assistance in trying to put him somewhere else or have him be sent somewhere else.

Q What were the concerns that led Suffolk employees to believe that he should be transferred?

MS. CAULO: Objection. Asked and answered. You may answer.

A My impression was that someone who was known as an informant in a correctional facility, their personal safety could not be assured. It's like being a snitch. I understood that he was fairly vocal about his working with the FBI. So his personal protection would be a concern.

Q Were you involved in the efforts to get him transferred?

A No.

Q Who was involved in the efforts to get him transferred?

A Exactly, I don't know. I know that Viktor Theiss spoke to me that he -- and I recall hearing Stan Wotjonski's name being mentioned

1 Captain Scoby would not have any interaction  
2 or any reason to be anywhere near Rene  
3 Rosario.

4 Q Did that, in fact, happen?

5 A It's my understanding that, yes, at some  
6 point the videotaping took place.

7 Q How long did Rene Rosario remain in the  
8 facility until he was transferred from that  
9 meeting on approximately?

10 A Well, I don't recall when that conversation  
11 took place, but I believe he was moved out  
12 around June 11th. So it would have been a  
13 week or more, I think.

14 Q What was the purpose of the recommendations  
15 or actions that you took?

16 MS. CAULO: Objection. Asked and  
17 answered.

18 Q You can answer.

19 A The one about videotaping him?

20 Q Yes.

21 A To protect both Rene Rosario and the officers  
22 from any concerns about how he was treated or  
23 any actions by the officers or Rene Rosario.

24 Q At some point did you learn that Mr. Rosario

18

20

as people that were making calls.

Q So that was reported, but you weren't directly involved in facilitating getting him transferred?

A Correct.

Q Were any special procedures put in place for Rene Rosario given his status as a federal informant?

A Yes.

Q What were those?

A At some point I had a conversation with then Superintendent Pat Bradley. After I had heard that Rene Rosario had complained that a Captain Scoby had threatened him and that he was -- that he had threatened him. So this was perhaps a few days after I first learned of Rene Rosario's presence in the facility.

Q I spoke with Superintendent Bradley, and we talked about precautions that we could take until Rene Rosario was moved. We agreed that his movements would be videotaped and there would always be two officers present with him and their movements and conversation with him would be videotaped and that

1 had made certain allegations of mistreatment  
2 by officers in May, 2003?

3 A Yes.

4 Q When did you learn of these allegations?

5 A I don't recall the exact date.

6 Q Approximately?

7 A Well, it was after I learned that he was back  
8 in the facility, and I would say  
9 approximately a week or so after -- well,  
10 maybe not a week. Less than a week, but more  
11 than, say, a day or two. So maybe between  
12 three and five days after learning he was  
13 back in the facility, I learned that there  
14 had been allegations made by Rene Rosario.

15 Q How did you learn of these allegations?

16 A From Viktor Theiss.

17 Q Was it a meeting that you had with  
18 Mr. Theiss?

19 A I don't recall, no.

20 Q What did you understand his allegations to  
21 be, Mr. Rosario's allegations?

22 A That a correctional officer or officers --  
23 I'm not entirely sure -- had assaulted him.

24 Q And you had mentioned earlier that he alleged

49 A What she had expected? I don't recall anything.

Q Did she tell you that she had requested a report from Miss Porter?

A My memory is that the report was requested by SID. There may have been a request made by Mary Ellen, but I understood this report being filed in the context of the SID investigation.

Q When you say the report was requested by SID, which person would have requested the report?

A Whoever was conducting the investigation for -- and I don't know which person would have asked for the report. I just assumed that we had asked for the report, we, SID; someone in SID had asked for the report.

Q Do you have personal knowledge that SID requested a report from Mrs. Porter?

A Do I?

Q Yes.

A No.

Q Do you have personal knowledge -- and I apologize if this has been asked already -- whether or not Miss Mastromilli requested a

51 1 circumstances of Miss Porter's involvement in the Rosario matter as you understood them; is that correct?

2 A Correct.

3 Q What did you relay to her? What were the facts and circumstances as you understood them at that point?

4 A I understood that Nurse Porter had made observations of Rene Rosario while he was in the infirmary and had reported something about that encounter to the FBI but that she had failed to document the medical file; that she had not timely filed a report as required and requested; that the report contained information about injuries that were inconsistent with what other medical personnel had described and what other people involved in the investigation had described were visible on Rene Rosario. That's what I recall talking to the Sheriff about specifically about the investigation.

5 I'm trying to think if there is anything else. I don't remember whether or not -- I don't remember right now whether or not I

50 report from Mrs. Porter?

A Not that I recall.

Q You know that a report was requested, and you believe that it was SID that requested that report; is that fair to say?

A Yes, at some point I also understood that Mary Ellen was also looking for the report. I thought she was just trying to get the report. I didn't know that she was specifically involved with asking for the report.

Q Did Viktor Theiss ever tell you that SID had requested a report from Miss Porter?

A I don't have a memory of that, no.

Q Did Viktor Theiss ever tell you that he personally had requested a report from her?

SCHMACHER: Why don't we take a 15 minute break.

(A brief recess was held.) During your conversation with her, I believe you testified that you were telling the facts and the

52 1 also spoke to the Sheriff at that time about information that I had learned towards the end of the investigation. It was actually the last bit of information that I heard, but in my mind was significant, and that was that Rene Rosario had in his conversations with people, officers, maybe investigators -- but I think it was officers -- not only talked about his being an informant for the FBI but spoke of Nurse Porter. I recall hearing something to the effect that he spoke publicly to people about her cooperation with the FBI; that she had either wired him or that she was wired on occasion or she was cooperating with the FBI.

16 It was that piece of information that 17 was significant to me in terms of bringing 18 the subject of barment to the Sheriff's 19 attention.

20 Q So your purpose in relating these facts and 21 circumstances to Sheriff Cabral was based on 22 this last piece of information that you 23 described?

24 MS. CAULO: Objection.

53  
 A No, that's why I'm saying I'm not sure that I spoke to the Sheriff about it. I just know that, when it came to my attention, that that information came to my attention about what Rene Rosario was saying, even though I knew at that point he was not a credible reporter and I didn't know that what he was saying was true, but that if it was heard by people, that it would put Nurse Porter's personal safety at issue.

Because I don't recall when the conversation with the Sheriff -- whether she initiated the discussion about Nurse Porter or I did, in my memory what sort of advanced the decision-making process as to what to do, that piece of information was important.

Q So you don't recall whether you initially brought up Nurse Porter during this conversation or whether the Sheriff did?

A I don't. I honestly don't.

Q When the topic came up, just to be clear, what was the purpose for discussing Nurse Practitioner Porter at that time?

A Because of the serious nature of the

1 in the Rosario matter?  
 2 MS. CAILO: Objection.  
 3 A I don't know when she became aware. I know  
 4 that in that conversation she had recently  
 5 had conversation with Viktor Theiss, and I  
 6 don't know to what extent Nurse Porter came  
 7 up in that conversation. But she seemed to  
 8 be aware of what I was discussing.  
 9 Q What did Sheriff Cabral say in response to  
 10 your opinion?  
 11 A I recall at one point she asked me, well, how  
 12 does that happen; if we are to bar her, how  
 13 does that happen.  
 14 Q What did you say in response?  
 15 A My memory is I said that we notify the  
 16 individual and then a written notice is given  
 17 to the shift commander.  
 18 Q Did she say anything else with regard to  
 19 Miss Porter at this time?  
 20 A I recall that she said that she should be  
 21 barred.  
 22 Q Did she explain why she thought that she  
 23 should be barred?  
 24 A I don't recall what she said. I know we

54

violations to decide what action would be taken.

Q I believe you testified before that you had an opinion about what action should be taken; is that right?

A Yes.

Q What was your opinion?

A My opinion was that we should bar her from the facility.

Q And you related that to Sheriff Cabral?

A Yes.

Q Did you tell her what that opinion was based on?

A I believe it was based on what I had just heard and the concerns that a nurse would not document in a medical file; that that was dangerous; that not documenting is inconsistent with what you hear in an investigation into potential misconduct or potential abuse.

Q Do you recall when Sheriff Cabral became involved?

56

1 discussed it, and she articulated her  
 2 feelings about it. But I don't remember what  
 3 she said.  
 4 Q Was it your understanding that it was your  
 5 responsibility to carry out the barring?  
 6 A Yes.  
 7 Q What steps did you take to put that into  
 8 effect?  
 9 A I called Deputy Superintendent Mary Ellen  
 10 Mastrorilli.  
 11 Q Why did you call Miss Mastrorilli?  
 12 A Because she would have been the person in the  
 13 chain of command who would have had oversight  
 14 over medical. She was in charge of medical  
 15 at the time. So the CMS employees or  
 16 contractors would be under her supervision.  
 17 Q Did you call Miss Mastrorilli?  
 18 A Yes, that is my memory, yes, that I called  
 19 her and told her that the decision had been  
 20 made to bar Sheila Porter.  
 21 Q How soon did that call take place after your  
 22 meeting with Sheriff Cabral?  
 23 A I don't think it was too much -- I mean, if  
 24 the conversation with Sheriff Cabral happened

61

1 called Mary Ellen Mastrorilli back.

2 Q What transpired during your conversation with  
3 Miss Powers?

4 MS. CAULO: Objection. Attorney client.

5 Q The purpose of your conversation with  
6 Miss Powers, was she relating legal advice to  
7 you at that time?

8 MS. CAULO: Objection.

9 A Yes.

10 Q After you looked at S220, did you contact  
11 Miss Mastrorilli again?

12 A Yes, I had it open in front of me. My memory  
13 is I picked up the phone, and I called Mary  
14 Ellen. And I told her the reasons that she  
15 could give or share with Sheila Porter.

16 Q What were those reasons?

17 A The reasons, as I recall, were she was -- you  
18 can tell her she's being barred for  
19 violations of S220. I remember that I was  
20 flipping through S220 and Section C, which  
21 has to do with -- confidential communications  
22 was first, so I may have mentioned that  
23 first; that she had communicated confidential  
24 inmate information outside the department. I

62

1 flipped through some more pages, and I  
2 remember telling her her failure to file a  
3 timely report, her failure to document a  
4 medical file. And I remember that -- again,  
5 I'm not sure of the order, but it was failure  
6 to document a medical file, failure to file a  
7 timely report.

8 I may have mentioned that her failure to  
9 file a report -- my memory is that I said  
10 this: That failure to file a report  
11 interfered with an ongoing investigation;  
12 that her report was inconsistent with other  
13 reports of what people claim to have seen in  
14 terms of injuries to Rene Rosario, so that it  
15 was not a credible report.

16 I remember hesitating, because I wasn't  
17 sure whether I wanted to say this, but I  
18 remember pausing. And I said, "And you can  
19 share with her that because Rene Rosario has  
20 been talking about his role as an informant  
21 and he has mentioned her name in the context  
22 of cooperating with the FBI, that the  
23 department could not assure her personal  
24 safety."

63

1 Q These were all factors that you related to  
2 Miss Mastrorilli during this conversation?  
3 A Yes, that's my memory of what I said to her.

4 Q Did you instruct her to relate this  
5 information to Mrs. Porter as the reasons for  
6 her barring?  
7 A I don't think I said "now tell her exactly  
8 what I just told you," but she asked me what  
9 the reasons were that she could give and  
10 that's what I told her.

11 Q And these are all included in the reasons  
12 that could be related to Miss Porter?

13 A Correct.

14 Q Do you know if Miss Mastrorilli, in fact, did  
15 relay this information to Mrs. Porter?

16 A I don't know what she said to her.

17 Q Did you have any follow-up conversations with  
18 Miss Mastrorilli?

19 A I recall having one.

20 Q What happened during that follow-up  
21 conversation?

22 A It was maybe a week or two later. It was  
23 after the meeting at the U.S. Attorney's  
24 Office. I know that. I asked her,

64

1 "Mary Ellen, did you write down the reasons  
2 that I gave you?" She said no. That was the  
3 one and only conversation I have had with  
4 Mary Ellen Mastrorilli about this since.

5 Q Did you talk about anything else during this  
6 final conversation other than whether she  
7 documented the reasons that you had provided  
8 for her?

9 A I don't recall, but I think that was the  
10 extent of the conversation.

11 Q If I have this right, I've counted four  
12 communications with Miss Mastrorilli on or  
13 after June 10th. The first was when you  
14 called her to tell her to bar Sheila Porter?

15 A Yes.

16 Q The second was when Miss Mastrorilli called  
17 you back to say that Miss Porter wanted to  
18 know the reasons why she was barred, and you  
19 said you'd get back to her?

20 A Correct.

21 Q The third was when you called her back after  
22 speaking with General Counsel and reviewing  
23 S220.

24 MS. CAULO: I object. I'm sorry.

129

practice and overall conduct of a person who is in a trusted position, a medical position, in a correctional facility, you need to be able to rely and trust completely in that person's judgment, the quality of care they perform. So it wasn't just S220.

Q Where do you get your understanding of good medical conduct from?

A My experience as an attorney, as a prosecutor, reviewing medical records and having to present cases in which the treatment and diagnosis of an individual is critical to establishing causation.

Q You don't personally have a medical background?

A No, I said that already.

Q With regard to whether or not Mrs. Porter was required to report her observations in Mr. Rosario's medical file, did you consult any medical or nursing guidelines to determine if that was required?

A No, I didn't.

Q Did you consult with any of CMS's materials to determine whether or not that was

131

1 MS. CAULO: Objection to the term,  
2 reason.  
3 A As I've indicated, it was an additional piece  
4 of information that I had that I felt was  
5 significant, in that it concerned the  
6 department's ability to provide personal  
7 safety for Nurse Porter. I didn't know the  
8 specifics of what Rene Rosario said, only  
9 that I learned that he had said he had been  
10 very open about himself being an informant;  
11 he was proud of that; he expected something  
12 because of it; and that he had spoken  
13 publicly about Sheila Porter and her  
14 involvement with him and his being wired.

15 Again, as I said before, I don't recall  
16 the specifics, but something about either her  
17 working with the FBI. Not knowing whether  
18 that was true or not, a rumor like that in a  
19 correctional facility is extremely  
20 problematic.

21 Q When you say Mr. Rosario was publicly telling  
22 people this, what do you mean?

23 A My understanding -- I heard this from Viktor  
24 Theiss -- was that Rene Rosario was talking

130

required?

A When you say that was required, that means to make notation in a patient's medical file?

Q Correct.

A No.

Q It was based on what your understanding was of good medical conduct; is that right?

MS. CAULO: Objection.

A It was based on the totality of the circumstances and common sense and expectation that in a correctional facility, when inmates allege that they have been abused and claim to have injuries, that those need to be documented, not only in a medical file, but reported immediately. This wasn't somebody complaining of a toothache. The accusations that he made were serious, and we were investigating them. We needed to rely on everyone's ability to do their job.

Q A final reason I believe you testified of why you believe Mrs. Porter should be banned was because Mr. Rosario had been telling people that Sheila Porter had cooperated with the FBI; is that right? Did I get that right?

132

1 to people during either interviews or any  
2 encounters people would be having, staff,  
3 correctional officers, whomever was having  
4 dealings with him; that he spoke openly about  
5 his involvement with the FBI.

6 Q As well as Mrs. Porter's, correct?

7 A At some point, yes. I don't know that he did  
8 that all along, but at some point -- as I  
9 said, it was towards the end of the  
10 investigation that I learned.

11 Q Because of that, you believed that  
12 Mrs. Porter's safety might be endangered if  
13 people within the corrections environment  
14 knew that?

15 A I thought so, yes.

16 Q And was this something that you discussed  
17 with Sheriff Cabral during your meeting?

18 A Again, I don't have -- I don't know if I  
19 mentioned that or not. My memory is I know  
20 that was a factor in my mind. It was a fact.  
21 I can't be sure that I shared it with her.

22 Q But you did share it with Miss Mastrorilli?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Would you have been likely to tell